arXiv:0804.1313v1 [math.RT] 8 Apr 2008

TILTING MODULES ARISING FROM RING EPIMORPHISMS

LIDIA ANGELERI HÜGEL AND JAVIER SÁNCHEZ

Abstract. We show that a tilting module T over a ring R admits an exact sequence $0 \to R \to T_0 \to T_1 \to 0$ such that $T_0, T_1 \in \mathrm{Add}(T)$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T_1, T_0) = 0$ if and only if T has the form $S \oplus S/R$ for some injective ring epimorphism $\lambda : R \to S$ with the property that $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(S, S) = 0$ and $\mathrm{pd} S_R \leq 1$. We then study the case where λ is a universal localization in the sense of Schofield [Sch85]. Using results from [CB91], we give applications to tame hereditary algebras and hereditary noetherian prime rings. In particular, we show that every tilting module over a Dedekind domain or over a classical maximal order arises from universal localization.

Introduction

Tilting theory started in the early eighties in representation theory of finite dimensional algebras as a tool to relate two module categories via functors inducing crosswise equivalences between certain parts of both categories. Nowadays tilting plays an important role in various branches of modern algebra, ranging from Lie theory and algebraic geometry to homotopical algebra. We refer to [AHKH06] for a survey on such developments.

In this paper, we will consider (large) tilting modules over an arbitrary ring R, according to the following definition. A right R-module T is said to be a *tilting module* if it satisfies the following properties:

(T1) T has projective dimension at most one.
(T2) $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(T, T^{(I)}) = 0$ for any set I.
(T3) There exists an exact sequence $0 \to R \to T_0 \to T_1 \to 0$ where T_0, T_1 are isomorphic to direct summands of direct sums of copies of T.

A typical example of a (not finitely generated) tilting module is provided by the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $T = \mathbb{Q} \oplus \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$. Its tilting class $\mathrm{Gen}\, T = \mathrm{Gen}\, \mathbb{Q}$ is the class of all divisible groups.

In fact, following this pattern, one can use localization techniques to construct tilting modules in many contexts. The papers [AHHT05, Sal04, Sal05] already contain results in this direction. In the present paper, we push forward this idea. We show that every injective ring epimorphism $\lambda : R \to S$ with the property that $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(S, S) = 0$ and $\mathrm{pd}\, S_R \leq 1$ gives rise to a tilting R-module $S \oplus S/R$ (Theorem 2.5). Moreover, we characterize the tilting modules that arise in this way. Namely, a tilting module T is equivalent to a tilting module $S \oplus S/R$ as above if and only if the exact sequence $0 \to R \to T_0 \to T_1 \to 0$ in condition (T3) can be chosen with the additional property that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T_1, T_0) = 0$ (Theorem 2.10).

Our construction yields many interesting examples of tilting modules. For example, if the total ring of quotients $Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)$ of R has projective dimension one over R, then $Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R) \oplus Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)/R$ is a tilting right R-module. Note that in general, however, the ring epimorphism $\lambda : R \to S$ need not be a perfect localization, see

---

Date: April 8, 2008.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16E30, 16E60, 16P50, 16S10.

Examples 2.11(1) and 3.17. Examples of tilting modules that do not arise from ring epimorphisms as above are given in Examples 2.11(3) and (4).

Given a tilting R-module $S \oplus S/R$ as above, in general it is difficult to compute its tilting class. In many cases, however, the tilting class can be described in terms of divisibility.

For example, if $\mathfrak{U}$ is a left Ore set of non-zero-divisors of R such that $\operatorname{pd}(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R_R) \leq 1$, then $T_{\mathfrak{U}} = \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R \oplus \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R/R$ is a tilting right R-module whose tilting class $\operatorname{Gen} T_{\mathfrak{U}}$ coincides with the class of $\mathfrak{U}$-divisible right R-modules (Corollary 3.14).

More generally, if $\mathcal{U}$ is a class of finitely presented right R-modules of projective dimension one such that $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\mathcal{U}, R) = 0$, we can consider the universal localization $R_{\mathcal{U}}$ of R at $\mathcal{U}$ in the sense of Schofield [Sch85]. Suppose that R embeds in $R_{\mathcal{U}}$, and $\operatorname{pd}(R_{\mathcal{U}})_R \leq 1$. Then $T_{\mathcal{U}} = R_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a tilting right R-module. If we further assume that $R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a direct limit of $\mathcal{U}$-filtered right R-modules, then the tilting class $\operatorname{Gen} T_{\mathcal{U}}$ coincides with the class $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ of all modules M satisfying $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(\mathcal{U}, M) = 0$ (Corollary 3.13).

From work of Schofield and Crawley-Boevey [CB91] we know that universal localizations satisfying such assumptions occur over hereditary rings with a faithful rank function ρ having the property that R_ρ is simple artinian, see Corollary 4.6. An important example for this situation is provided by finite-dimensional tame hereditary algebras, see [CB91]. In this case, we obtain a tilting module $T_{\mathcal{U}} = R_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ with tilting class $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ for every set $\mathcal{U}$ of simple regular modules (Example 4.7). In a forthcoming paper, this result will be used to classify the infinite-dimensional tilting modules over tame hereditary algebras.

Another interesting example is the case of a hereditary noetherian prime ring with (simple artinian) quotient ring A. In Theorem 5.7, we prove that in this case $T = A \oplus A/R$ is a tilting right R-module with tilting class $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ where $\mathcal{U}$ is the class of all simple right R-modules. Moreover, for any overring $R < S < A$ there exists a unique subset $\mathcal{U}_S$ of $\mathcal{U}$ such that $S \oplus S/R$ is a tilting right R-module with tilting class $\mathcal{U}_S^{\perp}$. And for any right Ore set $\mathfrak{S}$ consisting of regular elements, $T_{\mathfrak{S}} = R\mathfrak{S}^{-1} \oplus R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}/R$ is a tilting right R-module with tilting class $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\perp}$ where $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is the class of all simple modules whose elements are annihilated by some element of $\mathfrak{S}$.

In Corollary 5.10 we apply this result to a Dedekind domain R. We recover a classification result from [BET05] and show that the tilting modules $T_{\mathfrak{P}} = R_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{P}}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{P}}}/R$ arising from universal localization at $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{P}} = \{R/\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{P}\}$, where $\mathfrak{P}$ runs through all subsets of max-spec(R), form a representative set up to equivalence of the class of all tilting R-modules.

1. HOMOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF RING EPIMORPHISMS.

1.1. **Notation.** For a ring R (with 1), we denote by Mod-R the category of all right R-modules.

Moreover, given $M \in$ Mod-R, we write $\operatorname{pd} M$ for the projective dimension of M.

1.2. **Definition.** Let R, S be two rings. A morphism of rings $\lambda \colon R \to S$ is called a *ring epimorphism* if, for every pair of morphisms of rings $\delta_i \colon S \to T,\ i = 1, 2$, the condition $\delta_1\lambda = \delta_2\lambda$ implies $\delta_1 = \delta_2$.

Of course, if $\lambda \colon R \to S$ is a morphism of rings, then every right (left) S-module is a right (left) R-module, and every morphism of right (left) S-modules is a morphism of right (left) R-modules. Moreover, it is well known that the category Mod-S is a full subcategory of Mod-R if and only if λ is a ring epimorphism [Ste75, Chapter XI, Proposition 1.2].

We will mainly deal with injective ring epimorphisms which in addition satisfy the following homological property studied by Geigle and Lenzing in [GL91], see also [Dic77] and [Nee07].

1.3. **Definition.** Let R, S be two rings and $\lambda\colon R \to S$ a ring epimorphism. Then λ is a *homological ring epimorphism* if $\operatorname{Tor}_i^R(S,S) = 0$ for all $i > 0$.

Actually, we will see that in our context it is enough to require that $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(S,S) = 0$, a condition that Schofield has characterized as follows.

1.4. **Theorem** ([Sch85, Theorem 4.8]). *Let $\varphi\colon R \to S$ be a ring epimorphism. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(S,S) = 0$.
(2) $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(M,N) = \operatorname{Tor}_1^S(M,N)$ *for all* $M \in \text{Mod-}S$ *and* $N \in S\text{-Mod}$.
(3) $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(M,N) = \operatorname{Ext}_S^1(M,N)$ *for all* $M, N \in \text{Mod-}S$.
(4) $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(M,N) = \operatorname{Ext}_S^1(M,N)$ *for all* $M, N \in S\text{-Mod}$.

The following notion from [GL91] will be useful for our discussion.

1.5. **Definitions.** If $\mathcal{S}$ is a class of right R-modules, the *(right) perpendicular category to $\mathcal{S}$* is defined to be the full subcategory $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$ of Mod-R consisting of all modules A satisfying the following two conditions

a) $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S,A) = 0$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$.
b) $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S,A) = 0$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$.

If $\mathcal{S} = \{S\}$ we will write $\mathcal{X}_S$ instead of $\mathcal{X}_{\{S\}}$.

Given an injective homological ring epimorphism $\lambda\colon R \to S$, the right S-modules can be characterized inside the category of all right R-modules as the objects of the perpendicular category $\mathcal{X}_{S/R}$.

1.6. **Theorem** (cf. [GL91, Proposition 4.12]). *Let $\lambda\colon R \to S$ be an injective ring epimorphism with $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(S,S) = 0$. Then the following are equivalent for $M \in$ Mod-R.*

(1) $M \in \text{Mod-}S$.
(2) $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R,M) = \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R,M) = 0$.

Proof. Applying $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\_,M)$ to the exact sequence $0 \to R \to S \to S/R \to 0$ we get

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R,M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(S,M) \xrightarrow{\gamma} \operatorname{Hom}_R(R,M) \to \\ \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R,M) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S,M)$$

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) : If $M \in \text{Mod-}S$, then $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S,M) = \operatorname{Ext}_S^1(S,M) = 0$. Moreover the composition of maps $M \cong \operatorname{Hom}_S(S,M) = \operatorname{Hom}_R(S,M) \xrightarrow{\gamma} \operatorname{Hom}_R(R,M) \cong M$ is the identity on M, and γ is an isomorphism. Hence $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R,M) = \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R,M) = 0$.
(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) : Assume $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R,M) = \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R,M) = 0$. Then γ is an isomorphism, and $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S,M) \xrightarrow{\gamma} \operatorname{Hom}_R(R,M) \cong M$, $f \mapsto f_{|R} \mapsto f(1)$, endows M with a structure of right S-module. ■

1.7. **Remark.** As a consequence of the last proof, we see that for a right R-module M, the only possible structure as right S-module is the one given by $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S,M)$.

2. Tilting modules arising from ring epimorphisms

2.1. **Definitions.** Let R be a ring.

(1) Given a class $\mathcal{L}$ of right R-modules, we denote

$$\mathcal{L}^{\perp} = \{M \in \text{Mod-}R \mid \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(L, M) = 0 \text{ for all } L \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

If $\mathcal{L} = \{L\}$ we will write $L^{\perp}$ instead of $\{L\}^{\perp}$.

(2) For a right R-module M, we denote by $\operatorname{Add} M$ the class of all isomorphic images of direct summands of direct sums of copies of M, and by $\operatorname{Gen} M$ the class of all right R-modules generated by M, i.e. the right R-modules which are epimorphic images of arbitrary direct sums of copies of M.

(3) A right R-module T is said to be a *tilting module* if $\operatorname{Gen} T = T^{\perp}$. This is equivalent to the definition given in the introduction, see [CT95]. The class $T^{\perp}$ is called a *tilting class.*

(5) Two tilting modules T and T' are said to be *equivalent* if their tilting classes $T^{\perp}$ and $T'^{\perp}$ coincide. This is equivalent to the condition $\operatorname{Add}(T) = \operatorname{Add}(T')$.

2.2. **Example.** $\mathbb{Q} \oplus \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ is a tilting $\mathbb{Z}$-module. Its tilting class is the class $\operatorname{Gen}\mathbb{Q}$ of all divisible groups. Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is a ring epimorphism with $\operatorname{pd}\mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq 1$ and $\operatorname{Tor}^{\mathbb{Z}}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) = 0$.

We will now study tilting modules, like $\mathbb{Q} \oplus \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, constructed from injective ring epimorphisms. We start out with a generalization of some results from [AHHT05, Section 6], which in turn generalized part of [Mat73, Chapter 1]. The proofs are very similar to the ones in [AHHT05], so we mostly omit them.

2.3. **Lemma.** *Let $\lambda\colon R \to S$ be an injective ring epimorphism, and let M be a right R-module. The image of the morphism $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S, M) \to M$, $f \mapsto f(1)$ coincides with the trace $\operatorname{tr}_S(M) = \sum\{f(S) \mid f \in \operatorname{Hom}_R(S, M)\}$ of S in M.*

The following lemma generalizes [Mat73, Lemma 1.8].

2.4. **Lemma.** *Let R be a ring. Let $\lambda\colon R \to S$ be an injective ring epimorphism with $\operatorname{Tor}^R_1(S, S) = 0$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

a) $\operatorname{tr}_S(M/\operatorname{tr}_S(M)) = 0$ *for all* $M \in \text{Mod-}R$.

b) $\operatorname{Gen} S_R$ *is closed under extensions.*

Proof. *a)* ⇒ *b)* : Let $0 \to A \to B \to B/A \to 0$ be an exact sequence with $A, B/A \in \operatorname{Gen} S_R$. Since A is contained in $\operatorname{tr}_S(B)$, we get the surjective morphism of right R-modules $B/A \to B/\operatorname{tr}_S(B)$. Hence $B/\operatorname{tr}_S(B) \in \operatorname{Gen} S_R$, but by hypothesis $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S, B/\operatorname{tr}_S(B)) = 0$. Therefore $B/\operatorname{tr}_S(B) = 0$ and $B = \operatorname{tr}_S(B) \in \operatorname{Gen} S_R$.

b) ⇒ *a)* : Suppose $\operatorname{tr}_S(M/\operatorname{tr}_S(M)) \neq 0$ for some right R-module M. Then there exists a submodule X of M such that X contains $\operatorname{tr}_S(M)$, $X/\operatorname{tr}_S(M) \neq 0$ and $X/\operatorname{tr}_S(M) \in \operatorname{Gen} S_R$. Consider the exact sequence $0 \to \operatorname{tr}_S(M) \to X \to X/\operatorname{tr}_S(M) \to 0$. By hypothesis, $X \in \operatorname{Gen} S_R$, which implies $X = \operatorname{tr}_S(M)$, a contradiction. ■

2.5. **Theorem.** *Let R be a ring. Let $\lambda\colon R \to S$ be an injective ring epimorphism with $\operatorname{Tor}^R_1(S, S) = 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{X}_S$ the perpendicular category to S_R. The following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) $\operatorname{pd}(S_R) \leq 1$.

(2) $\mathcal{X}_S$ *is closed under cokernels of monomorphisms.*

(3) $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(S/R, M)$ *belongs to* $\mathcal{X}_S$ *for any right R-module M.*

(4) $(S/R)^{\perp} = \operatorname{Gen} S_R$.

(5) $T = S \oplus S/R$ *is a tilting right R-module.*

(6) $\operatorname{pd}((S/R)_R) \leq 1$.

Moreover, under (1)-(6), $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S, M/\operatorname{tr}_S(M)) = 0$ *for any right* R*-module* M*.*

Proof. For (1) ⇒ (2), see for example [GL91, Proposition 1.1] or [AHHT05, Proposition 6.3].

(2) ⇒ (3) : First of all, using that $\lambda\colon R \to S$ is an injective ring epimorphism with $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(S,S) = 0$, one shows as in [AHHT05, Lemma 6.1] that $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R, M)$ belongs to $\mathcal{X}_S$ for any right R-module M. Denote now by $E(M)$ the injective hull of M. Applying the functor $\operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R, \_)$ to the exact sequence $0 \to M \to E(M) \to E(M)/M \to 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R, E(M)) \xrightarrow{\beta} \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R, E(M)/M) \to \\ \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R, M) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R, E(M)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Our assumption (2) then yields that $\operatorname{im}\beta$ and $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R, M)$ belong to $\mathcal{X}_S$.

(3) ⇒ (4) : Let M be a right R-module. Applying $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\_, M_R)$ to the sequence $0 \to R \to S \to S/R \to 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(S/R, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(S, M) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \operatorname{Hom}_R(R, M) \to \\ \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R, M) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S, M) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(R, M) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The natural isomorphism $\operatorname{Hom}_R(R, M) \to M$, defined by $f \mapsto f(1)$, gives a map $\alpha\colon \operatorname{Hom}_R(S, M) \to M$ whose image is the trace of S in M by Lemma 2.3. Hence $M \in \operatorname{Gen} S_R$ if and only if α is surjective. If $M \in (S/R)^\perp$, then clearly α is surjective and $M \in \operatorname{Gen} S_R$. Conversely, suppose that α is surjective. Then $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R, M) \cong \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S, M)$, so $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S, M)$ belongs to $\mathcal{X}_S$ by (3). But $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S, M)$ is a right S-module, and the only right S-module which belongs to $\mathcal{X}_S$ is the zero module. Hence $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S, M) = \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(S/R, M) = 0$, and $M \in (S/R)^\perp$.

(4) ⇒ (5) : By (4), $\operatorname{Gen} T_R = \operatorname{Gen} S_R = (S/R)^\perp = T^\perp$, and so T is a tilting module.

(5) ⇒ (6) : If T_R is a tilting right R-module, then $\operatorname{pd} T_R \leq 1$, which clearly implies $\operatorname{pd}((S/R)_R) \leq 1$.

(6) ⇒ (1) is clear.

To prove the last part of the Theorem, notice that $\operatorname{Gen} S_R$ is closed under extensions by (4). Now apply Lemma 2.4. ■

2.6. **Remarks.** Suppose $\lambda\colon R \to S$ is a morphism of rings as in Theorem 2.5.

1. When R is a commutative ring and S the full ring of quotients of R, the objects of the right perpendicular category $\mathcal{X}_S$ are precisely the R-modules that Matlis called *cotorsion* in [Mat73].
2. In many cases, for example if R is a hereditary ring, $S \oplus S/R$ is a two-sided tilting R-module.

2.7. **Examples.** Let R be a ring.

1. Denote by $Q^r_{\max}(R)_R$ the *maximal right ring of quotients* of R, see e.g. [Ste75, p. 200]. Assume that $\operatorname{pd}(Q^r_{\max}(R)_R) \leq 1$ and that one of the following conditions is satisfied:
   (a) R is a right nonsingular ring such that every finitely generated non-singular right R-module can be embedded in a free module, or
   (b) $Q^r_{\max}(R)$ is right Kasch (for example, this holds true whenever $Q^r_{\max}(R)$ is semisimple).

   Then $Q^r_{\max}(R) \oplus Q^r_{\max}(R)/R$ is a tilting right R-module. This follows combining Theorem 2.5 with [Ste75, Chapter XII, Theorem 7.1] in case (a), or with [Ste75, Chapter XI, Proposition 5.3] in case (b).

(2) By [Ste75, Chapter XI, Theorem 4.1] there exist a ring $Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)$ and a ring epimorphism $\varphi\colon R \to Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)$ such that
   i) φ is an injective ring epimorphism and $Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)$ is flat as a left R-module.
   ii) For every injective epimorphism $\gamma\colon R \to T$ of rings such that ${}_RT$ is flat, there is a unique morphism of rings $\delta\colon T \to Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)$ such that $\delta\gamma = \varphi$.

If $\mathrm{pd}(Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)_R) \leq 1$, then we infer from Theorem 2.5 that $Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R) \oplus Q^r_{\mathrm{tot}}(R)/R$ is a tilting right R-module.

Our next aim is to characterize the tilting modules that arise from injective ring epimorphisms as in Theorem 2.5. We first introduce some terminology.

2.8. **Definitions.** Let R be a ring. Let M be a right R-module and $\mathcal{C}$ a class of right R-modules closed under isomorphic images.

(1) $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be a *torsion class* if it is closed under extensions, direct sums and epimorphic images.

(2) A morphism $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C)$ with $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-*preenvelope* of M provided the morphism of abelian groups $\mathrm{Hom}_R(f, C')\colon \mathrm{Hom}_R(C, C') \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C')$ is surjective for each $C' \in \mathcal{C}$, that is, for each morphism $f'\colon M \to C'$ there is a morphism $g\colon C \to C'$ such that the following diagram is commutative.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[dr, "f'"'] & C \arrow[d, dashed, "g"] \\
 & C'
\end{tikzcd}$$

(3) A $\mathcal{C}$-preenvelope $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C)$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-*envelope* of M provided that f is *left minimal*, that is, every $g \in \mathrm{End}_R(C)$ such that $f = gf$ is an automorphism.

(4) A $\mathcal{C}$-preenvelope $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C)$ is said to be a $\mathcal{C}$-*reflection* of M provided the morphism of abelian groups $\mathrm{Hom}_R(f, C')\colon \mathrm{Hom}_R(C, C') \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C')$ is bijective for each $C' \in \mathcal{C}$, that is, the morphism $g\colon C \to C'$ in the diagram above is always uniquely determined. Of course, every $\mathcal{C}$-reflection is a $\mathcal{C}$-envelope.

(5) $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be a *reflective* subcategory of Mod- R if every R-module M admits a $\mathcal{C}$-reflection.

2.9. **Remarks.** (1) If T is a tilting module, then every R-module M admits a $T^{\perp}$-preenvelope, see [AHTT01]. In particular, if $0 \to R \xrightarrow{a} T_0 \to T_1 \to 0$ is an exact sequence where $T_0, T_1 \in \mathrm{Add}\, T$ as in condition (T3) in the Introduction, then the map $a : R \to T_0$ is a $T^{\perp}$-preenvelope of R.

(2) It is well known that a class of right R-modules $\mathcal{C}$ is a reflective subcategory of Mod- R if and only if the inclusion functor $\iota : \mathcal{C} \to$ Mod- R has a left adjoint $\ell :$ Mod- $R \to \mathcal{C}$. Then a $\mathcal{C}$-reflection of M is given as $\epsilon_M : M \to \ell(M)$ where $\epsilon : 1_{\text{Mod-}R} \to \iota\,\ell$ is the unit of the adjunction, see e.g. [Ste75, Chapter X, §1].

(3) When they exist, $\mathcal{C}$-envelopes and $\mathcal{C}$-reflections are uniquely determined up to isomorphism.

We are now ready for the main result of this section.

2.10. **Theorem.** *Let R be a ring and T be a tilting right R-module. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) There is an injective ring epimorphism $\lambda : R \to S$ such that $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(S, S) = 0$ and $S \oplus S/R$ is a tilting module equivalent to T.

(2) There is an exact sequence $0 \to R \xrightarrow{a} T_0 \to T_1 \to 0$ such that $T_0, T_1 \in \mathrm{Add}\, T$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T_1, T_0) = 0$.

Moreover, under these conditions, $a : R \to T_0$ *is a* $T^{\perp}$*-envelope of* R*, and* $\lambda : R \to S$ *is a homological ring epimorphism.*

Proof. The implication (1)⇒(2) follows immediately by choosing the exact sequence $0 \to R \to S \to S/R \to 0$, keeping in mind that $\mathrm{Add}(S \oplus S/R) = \mathrm{Add}(T)$, and that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(S/R, S) = 0$ by Theorem 1.6.

For the implication (2)⇒(1), observe first that a is a $\mathrm{Gen}(T)$-preenvelope of R, so $\mathrm{Gen}\,T = \mathrm{Gen}\,T_0$ by [AHTT01, Lemma 1.1]. Moreover, it is easy to see that $T' = T_0 \oplus T_1 \in \mathrm{Add}\,T$ is a tilting module with $\mathrm{Gen}\,T' = \mathrm{Gen}\,T_0$. Then T' is equivalent to T, and $\mathrm{Gen}\,T = (T_0 \oplus T_1)^{\perp} = (T_1)^{\perp}$. In particular, $T_1^{\perp}$ is a torsion class, and T_1 is a partial tilting module in the sense of [CTT07].

Denote now by $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_{T_1}$ the perpendicular category of T_1. As shown in [CTT07, Proposition 1.3 and 1.4], $\mathcal{X}$ is a reflective subcategory of Mod$R$ which is closed under extensions, arbitrary direct sums and direct products, kernels and cokernels.

Then, as in [CTT07, Proposition 1.5], one can apply results of Gabriel and de la Peña [GdlP87, Theorem 1.2] or Geigle and Lenzing [GL91, Proposition 3.8] to obtain a ring epimorphism $\lambda : R \to S$ such that the category Mod-S, when viewed as a full subcategory of Mod-R, is equivalent to $\mathcal{X}$. More precisely, if $\ell : \text{Mod-}R \to \mathcal{X}$ is a left adjoint of the inclusion functor $\iota : \mathcal{X} \to \text{Mod-}R$, then $\ell(R)$ is a projective generator of $\mathcal{X}$, and the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_R(\ell(R), -)$ preserves coproducts. So, if we set $S = \mathrm{End}_R \ell(R)$, we obtain mutually inverse functors $\mathrm{Hom}_R(\ell(R), -)$ and $- \otimes_S \ell(R)$ between $\mathcal{X}$ and Mod-S. Moreover, the assignment $\lambda(r) = \ell(m_r)$, where $m_r : R \to R$ denotes the left multiplication with the element r, defines a ring epimorphism $\lambda : R \to S$. Note that $\lambda(r)$ is the uniquely determined element of S extending the endomorphism m_r of R. In other words, if $\epsilon_R : R \to \ell(R)$ is the $\mathcal{X}$-reflection of R, then $\lambda(r)\, \epsilon_R = \epsilon_R\, m_r$.

Now, in our case T_0 belongs to $\mathcal{X}$, and $R \xrightarrow{a} T_0$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-reflection of R, that is, we can choose $\epsilon_R = a$ and $\ell(R) = T_0$. In particular, since $a : R \to T_0$ is a monomorphism, $\lambda : R \to S$ is injective. Indeed, $\lambda(r) = 0$ implies $a\, m_r = 0$, hence $m_r = 0$ and $r = 0$. Moreover, T_0 and S_R are canonically isomorphic, thus S_R has projective dimension at most one, and λ is a homological ring epimorphism by [GL91, Corollary 4.8]. So, we conclude from Theorem 2.5 that $S \oplus S/R$ is a tilting module with tilting class $\mathrm{Gen}(S_R) = \mathrm{Gen}(T_0) = \mathrm{Gen}(T)$.

For the last statement, note that the $\mathcal{X}$-reflection $a : R \to T_0$ is left minimal, thus also a Gen$T$-envelope of R. ∎

2.11. **Examples.** (1) In general, in the situation of Theorem 2.10, S is not flat as a left R-module.

Let us look at [CTT07, Example 2.2]. Here R is the path algebra given by the quiver $3 \to 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 4$, and we consider the tilting R-module $T = \tau I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus I_4$. There is an exact sequence $0 \to R \to (\tau I_1)^3 \oplus (I_4)^3 \to I_2^4 \oplus I_3 \to 0$ where $T_1 = I_2^4 \oplus I_3$ and $T_0 = (\tau I_1)^3 \oplus (I_4)^3$ belong to $\mathrm{Add}(T)$, and $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T_1, T_0) = 0$. But the left adjoint $\ell : \text{Mod-}R \to \mathcal{X}$ of the inclusion functor $\iota : \mathcal{X} \to \text{Mod-}R$ is not (left) exact, and thus ${}_RS$ is not perfect, cf. [CTT07, Example 2.2].

An example where S is not flat as a right (nor as a left) R-module will be given in Example 3.17.

(2) If we omit the assumption $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T_1, T_0) = 0$, we still have a ring epimorphism $\lambda : R \to S$ such that $\mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to Mod-S. However, S_R need not have projective dimension at most one, and λ need not be a homological epimorphism. Consider [CTT07, Example 2.4]. Here R is the algebra given by the quiver $1 \xleftarrow{\alpha} 2 \xleftarrow{\beta} 3$ with the relation $\beta\alpha = 0$, and we take $T = R$ with the (split) exact

sequence $0 \to R \to R \oplus P_2 \to P_2 \to 0$. Then $S_R \cong S_3 \oplus S_1$ has projective dimension 2 and λ is not a homological epimorphism, cf. [CTT07, p.229].

(3) Let R be a hereditary (indecomposable) artin algebra of infinite representation type. Denote by $\mathbf{p}$ the preprojective component of R. There is a countably infinitely generated tilting R-module generating $\mathbf{p}^{\perp}$, called the *Lukas tilting module*, and denoted by L, cf. [Luk91, KT05]. It has the property that there are non-zero morphisms between any two non-zero modules from $\operatorname{Add} L$, see [Luk91, Theorem 6.1 (b)] and [Luk93, Lemma 3.3 (a)]. So, there cannot be an exact sequence $0 \to R \xrightarrow{a} L_0 \to L_1 \to 0$ such that $L_0, L_1 \in \operatorname{Add} L$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_R(L_1, L_0) = 0$, and therefore L does not arise from a ring epimorphism as above.

(4) Let R be a Prüfer domain which is not a Matlis domain, that is, the quotient field Q has projective dimension > 1 over R. Then R has no divisible envelope, see [GT06, Corollary 6.3.18]. So, the Fuchs tilting module δ, which is a tilting module generating the class of all divisible modules [GT06, Example 5.1.2], is another example of a tilting module that does not arise from a ring epimorphism as above.

3. Tilting modules arising from universal localization

Let us recall Schofield's notion of universal localization.

3.1. **Notation.** Let R be a ring. By $\mathcal{P}_R$ (${}_R\mathcal{P}$) we denote the category of all finitely generated projective right (left) R-modules.

Let P and Q be finitely generated projective right R-modules. By P^* we denote the finitely generated projective left R-module $\operatorname{Hom}_R(P, R)$. If $\alpha \in \operatorname{Hom}_R(P, Q)$, we denote by α^* the morphism of finitely generated left R-modules $\alpha^* \colon Q^* \to P^*$ defined by $\gamma \mapsto \gamma\alpha$.

For a class of morphisms Σ between finitely generated projective right R-modules we set $\Sigma^* = \{\alpha^* \mid \alpha \in \Sigma\}$.

3.2. **Theorem** ([Sch85, Theorem 4.1])**.** *Let R be a ring and Σ be a class of morphisms between finitely generated projective right R-modules. Then there are a ring R_Σ and a morphism of rings $\lambda\colon R \to R_\Sigma$ such that*

- *(i) λ is* Σ-inverting, *i.e. if $\alpha\colon P \to Q$ belongs to Σ, then $\alpha \otimes_R 1_{R_\Sigma} \colon P \otimes_R R_\Sigma \to Q \otimes_R R_\Sigma$ is an isomorphism of right R_Σ-modules, and*
- *(ii) λ is* universal Σ-inverting, *i.e. if S is a ring such that there exists a Σ-inverting morphism $\psi\colon R \to S$, then there exists a unique morphism of rings $\bar{\psi}\colon R_\Sigma \to S$ such that $\bar{\psi}\lambda = \psi$.*

3.3. **Definition.** $\lambda\colon R \to R_\Sigma$ as above is called the *universal localization of R at Σ*. In the same way one defines the universal localization at a class of morphisms between finitely generated projective left R-modules.

3.4. **Remarks.** Let R be a ring and let Σ be a class of morphisms between finitely generated projective right R-modules.

1. The universal localization R_Σ of R at Σ is unique up to isomorphism of R-rings, i.e. if $\lambda_i\colon R \to S_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are universal localizations of R at Σ, there exists a unique isomorphism of rings $\varphi\colon S_1 \to S_2$ such that $\varphi\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.
2. R_{Σ^*} is isomorphic to R_Σ.
3. $\lambda\colon R \to R_\Sigma$ is a ring epimorphism with $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(R_\Sigma, R_\Sigma) = 0$. So, if λ is injective and $\operatorname{pd} R_\Sigma \leq 1$, then we infer from Theorem 2.5 that $R_\Sigma \oplus R_\Sigma/R$ is a tilting module with tilting class $\operatorname{Gen} R_\Sigma = (R_\Sigma/R)^{\perp}$.
4. If $\lambda\colon R \to R_\Sigma$ is injective, then every $\alpha \in \Sigma$ is injective.

Proof. (1) follows from the universal property of universal localization. For a proof of (2), we refer to [Sch85, pages 51-52]. (3) holds by [Sch85, Theorem 4.7] and Theorem 1.4. For (4) see [Nee07, Proposition 2.2]. ■

Remarks 3.4 (2) and (4) show that the injectivity of all morphisms in Σ and Σ^* is a necessary condition for λ to be injective. Let us now turn to the cokernels of maps in Σ.

3.5. **Definitions.** (a) Let U be a right (left) R-module. We say that U is a *bound right (left) R-module* if U is finitely presented, $\operatorname{pd} U = 1$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_R(U,R) = 0$. In other words, U is a bound right (left) R-module if and only if U is the cokernel of some morphism $\alpha\colon P \to Q$ with $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_R$ (${}_R\mathcal{P}$) such that α and α^* are injective.

(b) If U is a bound module with projective presentation $0 \to P \overset{\alpha}{\to} Q \to U \to 0$, then we have an exact sequence $0 \to Q^* \overset{\alpha^*}{\to} P^* \to \operatorname{coker}\alpha^* \to 0$, and $\operatorname{coker}\alpha^*$ is the *Auslander-Bridger transpose* of U denoted by $\operatorname{Tr} U = \operatorname{coker}\alpha^*$, see for example [ARS95].

(c) Let now $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of bound right R-modules. For each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, consider a morphism α_U between finitely generated projective right R-modules such that

$$0 \to P \overset{\alpha_U}{\to} Q \to U \to 0 \tag{1}$$

is exact. We will denote by $R_{\mathcal{U}}$ the universal localization of R at $\Sigma = \{\alpha_U \mid U \in \mathcal{U}\}$. In fact, $R_{\mathcal{U}}$ does not depend on the chosen class Σ, cf. [Coh85, Theorem 0.6.2], and we will also call it the *universal localization of R at $\mathcal{U}$*. By abuse of notation, we will write $\alpha_U \in \mathcal{U}$ for any morphism α_U between finitely generated projective right R-modules as in (1) with $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

Finally, a right R-module N is said to be *$\mathcal{U}$-torsion-free* if $\operatorname{Hom}_R(U,N) = 0$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$, and N is said to be *$\mathcal{U}$-divisible* if $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(U,N) = 0$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

3.6. **Remark.** It is known that a tilting module T is of *finite type* [BH08, Theorem 2.6], that is, there exists a set $\mathcal{V}$ of finitely presented modules of projective dimension at most one such that $T^\perp = \mathcal{V}^\perp$. When R is a semihereditary ring, every finitely presented module M is of the form $M = P \oplus U$ where P is finitely generated projective and U is a bound module [Lüc97, Theorem 1.2(3)]. Thus every tilting class is of the form $\mathcal{V}^\perp$ where $\mathcal{V}$ is a set of bound modules if R is a semihereditary ring.

3.7. **Example.** If R is a ring and $\mathfrak{U} \subset R$ is a right denominator set, then the right Ore localization $R\mathfrak{U}^{-1}$ is the universal localization of R at all the maps $\alpha_u\colon R \to R$, $r \mapsto ur$, where $u \in \mathfrak{U}$. Equivalently, $R\mathfrak{U}^{-1}$ is the universal localization of R at the maps α_u^*, $u \in \mathfrak{U}$, given by right multiplication by u.

In the same way, if $\mathfrak{U}$ is a left denominator set, then $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R$ is the universal localization of R at the maps α_u, $u \in \mathfrak{U}$, and also the universal localization at the maps α_u^*, $u \in \mathfrak{U}$.

Notice further that if $\mathfrak{U}$ is a left Ore set of non-zero-divisors of R, then $\mathcal{U} = \{R/uR \mid u \in \mathfrak{U}\}$ and $\operatorname{Tr}\mathcal{U} = \{\operatorname{Tr} U \mid U \in \mathcal{U}\} = \{R/Ru \mid u \in \mathfrak{U}\}$ are sets of bound modules, and $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R = R_{\mathcal{U}} = R_{\operatorname{Tr}\mathcal{U}}$. Moreover, M is $\mathfrak{U}$-torsion-free iff M is $\mathcal{U}$-torsion-free, and M is $\mathfrak{U}$-divisible iff M is $\mathcal{U}$-divisible.

According to the definition above, the perpendicular category $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{U}}$ of a class of bound modules $\mathcal{U}$ consists of the $\mathcal{U}$-torsion-free and $\mathcal{U}$-divisible modules. It can also be interpreted as the category of modules over the universal localization of R at $\mathcal{U}$, as shown by Crawley-Boevey [CB91, Property 2.5] in a slightly less general situation.

3.8. **Proposition.** *Let R be a ring. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of bound right R-modules. The following statements are equivalent for $M \in$ Mod-R.*

(1) $M \in$ Mod-$R_{\mathcal{U}}$.
(2) $1_M \otimes_R \alpha_U^*$ is invertible for all morphisms $\alpha_U \in \mathcal{U}$.

(3) $\operatorname{Tor}^1_R(M, \operatorname{Tr} U) = M \otimes_R \operatorname{Tr} U = 0$ *for every right R-module $U \in \mathcal{U}$.*
(4) $\operatorname{Hom}_R(U, M) = \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(U, M) = 0$ *for every right R-module $U \in \mathcal{U}$.*

Proof. For the implication (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2), see the proof of [Sch85, Theorem 4.7].
(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) : Take $\alpha_U \in \mathcal{U}$. Then from

$$0 \to P \overset{\alpha_U}{\to} Q \to U \to 0$$

$$0 \to Q^* \overset{\alpha_U^*}{\to} P^* \to \operatorname{Tr} U \to 0,$$

we get the following commutative diagram of exact sequences

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Tor}_1^R(M, \operatorname{Tr} U) \arrow[r] & M \otimes_R Q^* \arrow[r, "1_M \otimes_R \alpha_U^*"] \arrow[d] & M \otimes_R P^* \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M \otimes_R \operatorname{Tr} U \arrow[r] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Hom}_R(U, M) \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Hom}_R(Q, M) \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Hom}_R(P, M) \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(U, M) \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the vertical arrows are isomorphisms. Hence $1_M \otimes_R \alpha_U^*$ is an isomorphism if and only if $\operatorname{Tor}^1_R(M, \operatorname{Tr} U) = M \otimes_R \operatorname{Tr} U = 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{Hom}_R(U, M) = \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(U, M) = 0$. ∎

3.9. **Proposition** (cf. [AHHT05, Remark 5.8]). *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of bound right R-modules, and $\operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{U} = \{\operatorname{Tr} U \mid U \in \mathcal{U}\}$. Then the class $\mathcal{U}^\perp$ of $\mathcal{U}$-divisible modules is a tilting class. Moreover, the class of $\operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{U}$-torsion-free modules is a cotilting class of left R-modules. More precisely, it is the cotilting class of cofinite type that corresponds to $\mathcal{U}^\perp$ under the bijective correspondence from* [AHHT06, Theorem 2.2].

Proof. For the first statement, see for example [GT06, Corollary 5.1.16]. For the second statement, recall that the correspondence in [AHHT06, Theorem 2.2] sends the tilting class $\mathcal{U}^\perp$ to the cotilting class $\mathcal{U}^\intercal = \{{}_R X \mid \operatorname{Tor}_1^R(U, X) = 0 \text{ for all } U \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

If $U \in \mathcal{U}$, and $0 \to P \overset{\alpha}{\to} Q \to U \to 0$ is a projective presentation of U with P and Q finitely presented, we obtain the exact sequences $0 \to Q^* \to P^* \to \operatorname{Tr} U \to 0$, and

$$0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Tor}_1^R(U, X) \longrightarrow P \otimes X \longrightarrow Q \otimes X \longrightarrow U \otimes X \longrightarrow 0$$

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(\operatorname{Tr} U, X) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(P^*, X) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(Q^*, X) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(\operatorname{Tr} U, X) \to 0.$$

Since $P \otimes_R X \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(P^*, X)$ and $Q \otimes_R X \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(Q^*, X)$ are naturally isomorphic, we get $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(U, X) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(\operatorname{Tr} U, X)$. Therefore $X \in \mathcal{U}^\intercal$ if and only if $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\operatorname{Tr} U, X) = 0$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$, that is, X is $\operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{U}$-torsion-free. ∎

When $\lambda : R \to R_\mathcal{U}$ is injective and $\operatorname{pd} R_\mathcal{U} \leq 1$, we have a tilting module $R_\mathcal{U} \oplus R_\mathcal{U}/R$ by Theorem 2.5. In general, however, its tilting class $\operatorname{Gen} R_\mathcal{U}$ does not coincide with the tilting class $\mathcal{U}^\perp$, as we will see in Example 4.7. The next result describes the case when $\operatorname{Gen} R_\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^\perp$. We first need some preliminaries.

3.10. **Definitions.** An ascending chain $(N_\nu | \nu < \kappa)$ of submodules of a right R-module N indexed by a cardinal κ is called *continuous* if $N_\nu = \bigcup_{\beta < \nu} N_\beta$ for all limit ordinals $\nu < \kappa$. The continuous chain is called a *filtration* of N if $N_0 = 0$ and $N = \bigcup_{\nu < \kappa} N_\nu$.

Given a class $\mathcal{U}$ of right R-modules, we say that a right R-module N is *$\mathcal{U}$-filtered* if it admits a filtration $(N_\nu | \nu < \kappa)$ such that $N_{\nu+1}/N_\nu$ is isomorphic to some module in $\mathcal{U}$ for every $\nu < \kappa$.

The following result is well known.

3.11. **Lemma** ([GT06, Lemma 3.1.2]). *Let M be a right R-module, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of right R-modules such that $M \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$. If N is a $\mathcal{U}$-filtered right R-module, then $M \in N^{\perp}$.*

3.12. **Theorem.** *Let R be a ring. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of bound right R-modules. Let further $\lambda : R \to S$ be an injective ring epimorphim with $\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(S,S) = 0$ and $\operatorname{pd} S_R \leq 1$. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $\operatorname{Gen} S_R = \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$.
(2) The map $\lambda \colon R \to S$ is a $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$-(pre)envelope.
(3) $S_R \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$, and every (pure-injective) module $M \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ belongs to $(S/R)^{\perp}$.

In particular, conditions $(1)-(3)$ hold true if $S_R \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ and S/R is a direct limit of $\mathcal{U}$-filtered right R-modules.

Proof. We already know by Theorem 2.5 that $T = S \oplus S/R$ is a tilting right R-module with $\operatorname{Gen} T = \operatorname{Gen} S_R = (S/R)^{\perp}$.
$(1) \Rightarrow (2)$: If $M \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp} = \operatorname{Gen} S_R$, then $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(S/R, M) = 0$, and therefore $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\lambda, M)$ is surjective. So, $\lambda : R \to S$ is a $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$-preenvelope. Suppose now that $g \in \operatorname{End}_R(S)$ satisfies $\lambda = g\lambda$. Since Mod-S is a full subcategory of Mod-R, $g \in \operatorname{End}_S(S)$. Now, since $g(1) = 1$, we get that g is the identity and therefore an isomorphism. So λ is even a $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$-envelope.
$(2) \Rightarrow (1)$: By the definition of a preenvelope, we have that S_R belongs to $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$. Since $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ is a torsion class, it follows $\operatorname{Gen} S_R \subseteq \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$. For the reverse inclusion, note that S_R is a generator of $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ by [AHTT01, Lemma 1.1].
$(1) \Rightarrow (3)$ follows from $(S/R)^{\perp} = \operatorname{Gen} S_R$.
$(3) \Rightarrow (1)$: Since $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ is a torsion class, we deduce as above $\operatorname{Gen} S_R \subseteq \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$. To prove equality, note that both classes are tilting classes. By [BH08, Theorem 1.6] it follows that they are both *definable classes*, that is, they are closed under direct products, direct limits, and pure submodules. As noted in Section 2 of [BH08], a combination of Ziegler's result [Zie84, Theorem 6.9] and Keisler-Shelah Theorem (cf. [Kei61] and [She71]) implies that $\operatorname{Gen} S_R$ and $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ coincide if and only if they contain the same pure-injective right R-modules. The latter holds true by (3).

We now prove the last statement. Suppose that $S_R \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ and $S/R = \varinjlim N_i$ where all N_i are $\mathcal{U}$-filtered right R-modules. By condition (3) it is enough to show that every pure-injective module $M \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ belongs to $(S/R)^{\perp}$. Now, for such module M we have

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(S/R, M) = \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(\varinjlim N_i, M) \cong \varprojlim \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(N_i, M).$$

Since all N_i are $\mathcal{U}$-filtered, $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(N_i, M) = 0$ by Lemma 3.11, thus $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(S/R, M) = 0$. ∎

3.13. **Corollary.** *Let R be a ring. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of bound right R-modules. Suppose that R embeds in $R_{\mathcal{U}}$, and $\operatorname{pd}(R_{\mathcal{U}})_R \leq 1$. Assume further that $R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a direct limit of $\mathcal{U}$-filtered right R-modules. Then $T_{\mathcal{U}} = R_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a tilting right R-module with $\operatorname{Gen} T_{\mathcal{U}} = \operatorname{Gen}(R_{\mathcal{U}})_R = \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$.*

Proof. Notice that $R_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ because $R_{\mathcal{U}}$ is a right $R_{\mathcal{U}}$-module, see Proposition 3.8. So, the statement follows immediately from Theorem 3.12 and Remark 3.4(3). ∎

We now give some applications of the last results. We start with an extension of [AHHT05, Proposition 6.4].

3.14. **Corollary.** *Let R be a ring. Let $\mathfrak{U}$ be a left Ore set of non-zero-divisors of R. Then $\operatorname{pd}(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R_R) \leq 1$ if and only if $\operatorname{Gen}(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R_R)$ coincides with the class of*

$\mathfrak{U}$-divisible right R-modules. In this case $T_{\mathfrak{U}} = \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R \oplus \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R/R$ is a tilting right R-module whose tilting class coincides with the class of $\mathfrak{U}$-divisible right R-modules.

Proof. Suppose $\operatorname{pd}(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R_R) \leq 1$. Since $\mathfrak{U}$ consists of non-zero-divisors, R embeds in $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R$. Setting $\mathcal{U} = \{R/uR \mid u \in \mathfrak{U}\}$, we know by Example 3.7 that $\mathcal{U}$ is a set of bound right R-modules and $R_{\mathcal{U}} \cong \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R$. On the other hand, given $u, v \in \mathfrak{U}$, there exist $z \in \mathfrak{U},\ w \in R$, such that $wu = zv$. Then

$$u^{-1}R + v^{-1}R \subseteq (zv)^{-1}R = (wu)^{-1}R.$$

Hence every finitely generated right submodule of $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R$ is contained in $u^{-1}R$ for some $u \in \mathfrak{U}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R/R = \varinjlim_{u\in\mathfrak{U}} u^{-1}R/R$. Moreover, notice that for every $u \in \mathfrak{U}$, $u^{-1}R/R \cong R/uR$, thus, $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R/R$ is a direct limit of the $\mathcal{U}$-filtered modules $u^{-1}R/R$. Then, applying Corollary 3.13, we obtain that $T_{\mathfrak{U}} = \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R \oplus \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R/R$ is a tilting right R-module and $\operatorname{Gen}(T_{\mathfrak{U}})_R = \operatorname{Gen}(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R)_R = \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$.

The proof of the other implication is given in the last paragraph of the proof of [AHHT05, Proposition 6.4]. ■

3.15. **Remark.** If $\mathfrak{U}$ is a twosided Ore set of non-zero-divisors, then $\operatorname{pd}({}_R\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R) \leq 1$ if and only if $\operatorname{Gen}({}_R\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R)$ coincides with the class of $\mathfrak{U}$-divisible left R-modules. In fact, in this case $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R = R\mathfrak{U}^{-1} = R_{\mathcal{U}}$, and we can apply the left version of Corollary 3.13 on ${}_RR\mathfrak{U}^{-1}$.

However, if $\mathfrak{U}$ is just a left Ore set of non-zero-divisors of R, and $\operatorname{pd}({}_R\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R) \leq 1$, then $T_{\mathfrak{U}} = \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R \oplus \mathfrak{U}^{-1}R/R$ is a tilting left R-module by Theorem 2.5, but we cannot compute $T_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\perp}$ as we don't know whether $\mathfrak{U}^{-1}R/R$ can be written as a direct limit of $\{R/Ru \mid u \in \mathfrak{U}\}$-filtered left R-modules.

Stronger results will be obtained in Theorem 5.7 under the assumption that R is a hereditary noetherian prime ring.

3.16. **Corollary** ([GT06, Remark 6.3.17])**.** *Let R be a commutative valuation domain with field of fractions Q. Suppose that $\operatorname{pd}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})_R \leq 1$ for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R (equivalently, suppose that $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is countably generated as an R-module for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R). Then the set $\mathbb{T} = \{T_{\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}} \oplus R_{\mathfrak{p}}/R \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)\}$ is a representative set up to equivalence of the class of all tilting R-modules.*

Proof. For each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, let $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{p}} = R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. By Corollary 3.14 we know that $T_{\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}} \oplus R_{\mathfrak{p}}/R$ is a tilting R-module and $T_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\perp}$ equals the class of $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{p}}$-divisible R-modules.

It is known that the set of Fuchs tilting modules $\{\delta_{\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{p}}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)\}$ is a representative set up to equivalence of the class of all tilting R-modules, and $\delta_{\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\perp}$ is the class of $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{p}}$-divisible R-modules [GT06, Theorem 6.2.21].

The assumption that $\operatorname{pd}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})_R \leq 1$ for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is satisfied if and only if $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is countably generated as an R-module for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R. In fact, if R is a commutative local ring and $\mathfrak{U}$ is a multiplicative subset of non-zero-divisors, then $\operatorname{pd} R\mathfrak{U}_R^{-1} \leq 1$ if and only if $R\mathfrak{U}_R^{-1}$ is countably generated R-module [AHHT05, Page 531]. In the particular case when R is a valuation domain see [FS85, Theorem IV.3.1] ■

3.17. **Example.** (see also [Nee07, Example 0.2]) Let X be a nonempty set. Let G be the free group on X. Let k be a field. Consider the free algebra $R = k\langle X\rangle$ and the free group algebra kG with the natural embedding $k\langle X\rangle \hookrightarrow kG$ which sends $x \mapsto x$ for every $x \in X$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{k\langle X\rangle/xk\langle X\rangle \mid x \in X\}$. Then $T_X = kG \oplus kG/k\langle X\rangle$ is a tilting right R-module with $T_X^{\perp} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$.

In fact, if $\Sigma = \{\alpha_x \mid x \in X\}$ where $\alpha_x\colon k\langle X\rangle \to k\langle X\rangle$ is defined by $p \mapsto xp$, then kG can be regarded as the universal localization of R at $\mathcal{X}$. Since $k\langle X\rangle$ is hereditary, $\mathrm{pd}(kG) \leq 1$, so T_X is a tilting right R-module by Remark 3.4(3).

Note that $\mathcal{X}$ is a set of bound right $k\langle X\rangle$-modules. Since kG is a right kG-module, $kG \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ by Proposition 3.8. We now verify condition (2) in Theorem 3.12. Let $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. We have to show that for every $k\langle X\rangle \xrightarrow{\widetilde{f}} M$, there exists $f\colon kG \to M$ extending $\widetilde{f}$. We will define f on the elements of G and then extend it by linearity.

Every element $g \in G$ can be uniquely expressed as a word of the form

$$g = x_1^{e_1} \cdots x_r^{e_r} \text{ where } x_i \in X,\ e_i = \pm 1 \text{ and } x_i \neq x_{i+1} \text{ if } e_i = -e_{i+1}. \tag{2}$$

We proceed by induction on the length of g. If $r = 0$, that is, $g = 1$, then we define $f(1)$ as $\widetilde{f}(1)$. Let $r+1 > 0$ and suppose we have defined $f(g)$ for all $g \in G$ of length $\leq r$. Let g be a word of length $r+1$, suppose $g = x^{e_1} \cdots x_{r+1}^{e_{r+1}} = hx_{r+1}^{e_{r+1}}$ as in (2). Notice that for each $m \in M$ and $x \in X$ there exists $n \in M$ such that $m = nx$. This can be seen applying $\mathrm{Hom}_R(\_, M)$ to the short exact sequence determined by α_x and the fact that $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. So fix $n \in M$ such that $nx_{r+1} = f(h)$. Then

$$f(g) = \begin{cases} f(h)x_{r+1}^{e_{r+1}} & \text{if } e_{r+1} = 1 \\ n & \text{if } e_{r+1} = -1. \end{cases}$$

Hence $k\langle X\rangle \hookrightarrow kG$ is an $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$-preenvelope, and $T_X^{\perp} = \mathrm{Gen}\, kG = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$.

Finally, observe that kG is not a flat right (left) $k\langle X\rangle$-module if $|X| \geq 2$. Indeed, let $x \neq y \in X$. Consider the unique embedding of left (right) $k\langle X\rangle$-modules such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} k\langle X\rangle \oplus k\langle X\rangle & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & k\langle X\rangle \\ (1,0) & \longmapsto & x \\ (0,1) & \longmapsto & y \end{array}$$

Consider $1_{kG} \otimes \alpha\colon kG \oplus kG \longrightarrow kG$. Then $(x^{-1}, 0)$ and $(0, y^{-1})$ have the same image 1. Thus $1_{kG} \otimes \alpha$ $(\alpha \otimes 1_{kG})$ is not injective.

It can be seen that T_X is also a tilting left R-module with ${}_RT_X^{\perp} = \{k\langle X\rangle / k\langle X\rangle x \mid x \in X\}^{\perp}$.

4. PROJECTIVE RANK FUNCTIONS

We recall some notions and results from [Sch85] and [CB91]. For details, we refer to [Sch85, Theorems 1.11, 1.16, 1.18, 1.22, 5.1, 5.5] and [CB91, Theorem 1.4].

4.1. **Definitions.** Let R be a ring. We denote by $K_0(R)$ the *Grothendieck group* of finitely generated projective right R-modules modulo direct sums, that is, the abelian group generated by the isomorphism classes $[P]$ of $P \in \mathcal{P}_R$ modulo the relations $[P] + [Q] - [P \oplus Q]$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_R$.

(a) A *(projective) rank function* on a ring R is a morphism of groups $\rho\colon K_0(R) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

(i) $\rho([P]) \geq 0$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_R$,
(ii) $\rho([R]) = 1$.

If $\rho([P]) > 0$ for every nonzero $P \in \mathcal{P}_R$, we say that ρ is a *faithful rank function.* For sake of simplicity we will write $\rho(P)$ instead of $\rho([P])$.

(b) Let $\alpha\colon P \to Q$ be a morphism between finitely generated projective right R-modules. Consider the finitely generated projective right R-modules P' such that there exist morphisms β, γ making the following diagram commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd} P \arrow[rr, "\alpha"] \arrow[dr, "\beta"'] & & Q \\ & P' \arrow[ur, "\gamma"'] & \end{tikzcd} \tag{3}$$

We define the *inner rank* of α as $\rho(\alpha) = \inf\{\rho(P') \mid P' \text{ satisfies } (3)\}$.

(c) We say that a morphism between finitely generated projective right R-modules $\alpha\colon P \to Q$ is *full* in case $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(P) = \rho(Q)$. We denote the localization of R at the set of all full morphisms by R_ρ, and we call it the *universal localization of R at ρ*. If ρ is faithful and α is full, we define α to be an *atomic full morphism* if, in any nontrivial factorization as in (3), we have $\rho(P') > \rho(P) = \rho(Q) = \rho(\alpha)$.

4.2. **Theorem.** *Let R be a hereditary ring with a faithful rank function ρ. Let Σ be a collection of full maps. Then R embeds in R_Σ.*

4.3. **Definition.** Suppose R is a semihereditary ring with a faithful rank function ρ. Notice that every full map is injective under these assumptions since $P \cong \ker\gamma \oplus \operatorname{im}\gamma$ for every morphism $\gamma\colon P \to Q$ between finitely generated projective right R-modules. Let M be a right R-module. We say that M is *ρ-torsion* if M is the cokernel of a full morphism. We say that M is *ρ-simple* if M is the cokernel of an atomic full morphism.

Of course, the ρ-torsion (and the ρ-simple) modules are bound right R-modules. Moreover, if R is hereditary, then the ρ-torsion modules form an exact abelian length category (that is, every object has finite length) whose simple objects are the ρ-simples.

For a characterization of ρ-torsion, ρ-simple modules in the hereditary case see [CB91, Definition 1.3].

4.4. **Theorem** ([Sch86], [Sch85, Theorem 12.6])**.** *Let R be a hereditary ring with a faithful rank function ρ such that R_ρ is a simple artinian ring. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of ρ-simple modules. The following statements hold true.*

1. *As a right R-module, $R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a directed union of finitely presented modules N_i such that each N_i is a finite extension of modules from $\mathcal{U}$.*
2. *As a left R-module, $R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a directed union of finitely presented modules M_j such that each M_j is a finite extension of modules of the form $\operatorname{Tr} U$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}$.*

In particular, the Theorem above applies in the following situation.

4.5. **Theorem.** *Let R be a hereditary ring. Suppose R has a unique rank function ρ, and suppose that ρ takes values in $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}$ for some positive integer n. Then the universal localization R_ρ of R at ρ is a simple artinian ring.*

Let us now apply the results above. Combining Theorems 4.2 and 4.4 with Remark 3.4(3) and Corollary 3.13, we immediately obtain the following.

4.6. **Corollary.** *Let R be a hereditary ring with a faithful rank function ρ. The following statements hold true.*

1. *If $\mathcal{V}$ is a class of ρ-torsion right R-modules, then $T_{\mathcal{V}} = R_{\mathcal{V}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{V}}/R$ is a tilting right R-module.*
2. *Suppose R_ρ is simple artinian. If $\mathcal{U}$ consists of ρ-simple modules, then $T_{\mathcal{U}} = R_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a tilting right R-module with tilting class $T_{\mathcal{U}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$, and it is also a tilting left R-module with tilting class ${}_R T_{\mathcal{U}}{}^{\perp} = (\operatorname{Tr}\mathcal{U})^{\perp}$.*

In general, if $\mathcal{V}$ is just a class of ρ-torsion right R-modules, the tilting class $\operatorname{Gen} T_{\mathcal{V}}$ differs from $\mathcal{V}^{\perp}$, as we are going to see next.

4.7. **Example.** Let R be an (indecomposable) tame hereditary algebra. Then $K_0(R)$ is the free abelian group with basis the (finite number of) isomorphism classes of simple right R-modules $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$, and there is a bilinear form $B_R\colon K_0(R) \times K_0(R) \to \mathbb{Z}$ given by

$$B_R([M],[N]) = \dim_k \operatorname{Hom}_R(M,N) - \dim_k \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(M,N)$$

with corresponding quadratic form $\chi_{_R}\colon \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} K_0(R) \to \mathbb{Q}$. Since R is of tame representation type, $\chi_{_R}$ is positive semidefinite but not positive definite.

Moreover, the $\mathbb{Q}$-subspace $N \leq \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} K_0(R)$ formed by the radical vectors of B_R is one-dimensional and can be generated by a vector v with coordinates $(v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ in the basis $\{[S_1], \dots, [S_n]\}$ with at least one component $v_i = 1$, see [Rin84]. Hence $\chi_{_R}(v) = 0$ and any other w such that $\chi_{_R}(w) = 0$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-multiple of v.

Following [CB91, Section 4], we define a faithful rank function $\partial_R\colon K_0(R) \to \mathbb{Q}$ by

$$\partial_R([M]) = \frac{B_R([M],v)}{B_R([R],v)}.$$

It is called the *normalized defect for R.*

The indecomposable ∂_R-torsion modules coincide with the regular modules and the ∂_R-simple modules with the simple regular modules. Moreover, it was shown in [CB91, Lemma 4.4] that R_{∂_R} is a simple artinian ring. From Corollary 4.6(2) we infer that for every set $\mathcal{U}$ of simple regular right R-modules, the right R-module $T_{\mathcal{U}} = R_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{U}}/R$ is a tilting module with tilting class $T_{\mathcal{U}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$.

Let us now assume that there is a stable tube $\mathbf{t}_\nu$ of width at least 3. Let S be a simple regular module such that $[S] \in \mathbf{t}_\nu$. Consider the modules τS, $\tau^- S$, $S[2]$ and $\tau S[2]$.

The ∂_R-torsion module $S[2]$ is an extension of the ∂_R-simple modules S and $\tau^- S$. Similarly, $\tau S[2]$ is an extension of the ∂_R-simple modules τS and S. Hence we can suppose that $S[2]$, $\tau S[2]$ have finite projective presentations

$$0 \to P_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q_1 \to \tau S[2] \to 0$$

$$0 \to P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} Q_2 \to S[2] \to 0$$

where α and β are full morphisms, and that $\alpha = \delta\gamma$, $\beta = \varepsilon\delta$ where $\gamma, \delta, \varepsilon$ are full atomic morphisms with $\operatorname{coker}\gamma = \tau S$, $\operatorname{coker}\delta = S$ and $\operatorname{coker}\varepsilon = \tau^- S$.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{S[2],\ \tau S[2]\}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \{S,\ \tau S,\ \tau^- S\}$. Then $R_{\mathcal{V}} = R_{\{\alpha,\beta\}} \cong R_{\{\gamma,\delta,\varepsilon\}} = R_{\mathcal{U}}$. Therefore $T_{\mathcal{V}} = R_{\mathcal{V}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{V}}/R$ is a tilting right R-module with $T_{\mathcal{V}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$. But $\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ is different from $\mathcal{V}^{\perp}$. In fact, using the AR-formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(S[2],S) &\cong D\operatorname{Hom}_R(S,\tau S[2]) = 0 \\ \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(\tau S[2],S) &\cong D\operatorname{Hom}_R(S,\tau^2 S[2]) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $S \in \mathcal{V}^{\perp}$. But

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(\tau^- S,S) \cong D\operatorname{Hom}_R(S,\tau\tau^- S) \cong D\operatorname{Hom}_R(S,S) \neq 0,$$

that is, $S \notin \mathcal{U}^{\perp}$.

4.8. **Remark.** Many rings satisfy the conditions in Corollary 4.6(2), for example tame hereditary algebras (see above), Dedekind prime rings [CB91, Proposition 3.1 (2)] and firs. Hereditary local rings, free algebras and free group algebras are examples of firs.

5. Noetherian prime rings

5.1. **Notation.** Let R be a right order in a semisimple ring A, i.e. A is the right Ore localization of R at the set $\mathcal{C}_R$ of regular elements of R. Let n be the length of A as a right A-module. We define the rank function $u\colon K_0(R) \to \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}$ given by

$$u(P) = \frac{\operatorname{length}(P \otimes_R A_A)}{n},$$

called the *normalized uniform dimension*, see [CB91].

Let $\mathcal{U}_r$ be a set of representatives of all isomorphism classes of finitely presented simple right R-modules. Let $\mathcal{V}_r$ be a set of representatives of all isomorphism classes of finitely presented torsion right R-modules. Let finally $\mathcal{D}_r = \{R/sR \mid s \in \mathcal{C}_R\}$. In the same way we define $\mathcal{U}_l,\ \mathcal{V}_l,\ \mathcal{D}_l$.

5.2. **Remarks.** (1) Since A is the right Ore localization of R at $\mathcal{C}_R$, the left R-module ${}_RA$ is flat. Moreover a right R-module V_R is torsion if and only if $V \otimes_R A = 0$.

(2) Since every projective right R-module is torsionfree, u is a faithful rank function.

Recall the following result which can be found, for example, in [Jat86, Corollary 2.2.12].

5.3. **Lemma.** *Let R be a right order in a simple artinian ring. If there exists a simple torsionfree right R-module, then R itself is a simple artinian ring.*

The following result is a generalization of the foregoing Lemma to the semisimple situation.

5.4. **Lemma.** *Let R be a right order in a semisimple ring A. If there exists a simple torsionfree right R-module, then there exists a primitive central idempotent e of A such that eRe is a simple artinian ring.*

Proof. Suppose M is a simple torsionfree right R-module. It is known that there exists a right ideal I of R such that M and I have isomorphic essential submodules, see for example [Jat86, Proposition 2.2.11]. Hence, since M is simple, M embeds in R. So we can suppose M is a right ideal of R. There exists a primitive central idempotent e of A such that $Me \neq 0$. Then $Me \cong M$ as right R-modules, and Me is a simple torsion free right eRe-module. Notice that eRe is a right order in the simple artinian ring eAe. Thus eRe is simple artinian by Lemma 5.3. ∎

5.5. **Proposition** (cf. [CB91, Section 3]). *Let R be a semihereditary right order in a semisimple ring A. Suppose there is no primitive central idempotent e of A such that eRe is simple artinian. Then*

(1) The class of finitely presented torsion right R-modules coincides with the class of u-torsion modules.
(2) The class of finitely presented simple right R-modules coincides with the class of u-simple modules.
(3) A equals R_u, the universal localization of R at u.

Proof. (1) Given a finitely presented torsion right R-module V_R (hence $\operatorname{pd} V_R = 1$) with finite projective presentation $0 \to P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q \to V \to 0$, applying $\_ \otimes_R A$, we get $0 \to P \otimes_R A \xrightarrow{\alpha\otimes 1_A} Q \otimes_R A \to V \otimes_R A = 0$. Hence $u(P) = u(Q) = u(\alpha)$, and V is a u-torsion module. Conversely, if V is a u-torsion module, then V is a finitely presented module with $\operatorname{pd} V_R = 1$. Let $0 \to P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q \to V \to 0$ be a projective presentation of V with P and Q finitely generated. Notice that $\operatorname{length}(P \otimes_R A) = \operatorname{length}(Q \otimes_R A)$. Hence $\alpha \otimes 1_A$ is an isomorphism and $V \otimes_R A = 0$. Thus V is a torsion right R-module.

(2) Let U be a finitely presented simple right R-module with finite projective presentation $0 \to P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q \to U \to 0$. Since U is simple and there is no primitive central idempotent e of A such that eRe is simple artinian, Lemma 5.4 implies U is a torsion right R-module, and therefore u-torsion with $\operatorname{pd} U_R = 1$ by (1). Now

suppose

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P \arrow[rr, "\alpha"] \arrow[dr, "\beta"'] & & Q \\
& P' \arrow[ur, "\gamma"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

with $u(P') = u(P) = u(Q) = u(\alpha)$. Hence $\mathrm{length}(Q \otimes_R A) = \mathrm{length}(P' \otimes_R A)$. Since $\alpha \otimes 1_A$ is surjective, we get $\gamma \otimes 1_A$ is an isomorphism. Hence we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P' \otimes_R A \arrow[r, "\cong"] & Q \otimes_R A \\
P' \arrow[u] \arrow[r, "\gamma"'] & Q \arrow[u]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the vertical arrows are injective. Hence γ is injective. Clearly β is injective. Now, since $U \cong Q/P$ is simple, we get that β or γ is an isomorphism. This shows that U is u-simple.

On the other hand, if U is a u-torsion module which is not a simple module, then it contains a finitely generated submodule $0 \neq V \subsetneqq U$. Suppose $0 \to P \overset{\alpha}{\to} Q \to U \to 0$ is a projective presentation of U with P and Q finitely generated. Then there exists a finitely generated submodule $0 \neq P' \subsetneqq Q$ such that $P'/P \cong V$. Since R is semihereditary, P' is a projective right R-module. Now α factors through P' in the following way

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P \arrow[rr, "\alpha"] \arrow[dr, hook] & & Q \\
& P' \arrow[ur, hook] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

and U cannot be a u-simple module since $u(P) = u(Q) = u(P')$.

(3) If $0 \to P \overset{\alpha}{\to} Q \to W \to 0$ is an exact sequence with W torsion and P, Q finitely generated projective right R-modules, then $\alpha \otimes 1_A \colon P \otimes_R A \to Q \otimes_R A$ is an isomorphism. Therefore condition (i) in Theorem 3.2 is satisfied.

Let $b \colon R \to B$ be a morphism of rings such that $\alpha \otimes 1_B$ is invertible for every full morphism $P \overset{\alpha}{\to} Q$. By (1), α is full if and only if $\operatorname{coker} \alpha$ is torsion. If $s \in \mathcal{C}_R$, R/sR is torsion. Therefore the map $\alpha_s \colon R \to R$, defined by $r \mapsto sr$, is a full morphism and $\alpha_s \otimes 1_B$ is invertible. Hence $b(s)$ is invertible in B. By the universal property of Ore localization there exists a unique morphism of rings $\psi \colon A \to B$ such that $\psi_{|R} = b$. Thus condition (ii) in Theorem 3.2 is satisfied. ∎

The following result is a generalization of [ER70, Theorem 1.3] to the semisimple situation. We prove it using the theory of rank functions.

5.6. **Theorem.** *Let R be a hereditary noetherian semiprime ring which is a right order in the semisimple ring A. Suppose there is no primitive central idempotent e of A such that eRe is simple artinian. Let $J \subseteq I$ be right ideals of R. Then I/J is an artinian right R-module if and only if J is an essential submodule of I.*

Proof. We use the following known fact, see for example [Jat86, Proposition 2.2.2]: If R is a right order in a semisimple ring, then a submodule N of a torsion-free right R-module M is essential in M if and only if M/N is torsion.

Suppose I/J is artinian. Then it has finite length, that is, it is a finite extension of simple right R-modules, and hence torsion right R-modules by Lemma 5.4. Thus I/J is torsion.

On the other hand suppose J is an essential submodule of I. By the remark at the beginning of the proof, I/J is a finitely presented torsion right R-module. By the discussion on Definition 4.3 and Proposition 5.5 it follows that I/J has finite length. ∎

Now we come to the main result of this section.

5.7. **Theorem.** *Let R be a hereditary noetherian prime ring which is not simple artinian. Let A_R be the simple artinian quotient ring of R. Then*

(1) $T = A \oplus A/R$ is a tilting right R-module with $T^\perp = \mathcal{U}_r^\perp = \mathcal{V}_r^\perp = \mathcal{D}_r^\perp$.

(2) $T = A \oplus A/R$ is a tilting left R-module with $T^\perp = \mathcal{U}_l^\perp = \mathcal{V}_l^\perp = \mathcal{D}_l^\perp$.

(3) For any overring $R < S < A$ there exists a unique subset $\mathcal{U}_S$ of $\mathcal{U}_r$ (respectively, of $\mathcal{U}_l$) such that $S \oplus S/R$ is a tilting right (left) R-module with tilting class $\mathcal{U}_S^\perp$.

(4) For any right Ore subset $\mathfrak{S}$ of $\mathcal{C}_R$, let

$$\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S} = \{U \in \mathcal{U}_r \mid \textit{for each } v \in U \textit{ there exists } s \in \mathfrak{S} \textit{ with } vs = 0\}.$$

Then $R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}$ is the universal localization of R at $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}$. Moreover, $T_\mathfrak{S} = R\mathfrak{S}^{-1} \oplus R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}/R$ is a tilting right R-module with tilting class $T_\mathfrak{S}^\perp = \mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}^\perp$, and $T_\mathfrak{S}$ is a tilting left R-module with tilting class $T_\mathfrak{S}^\perp = \{R/Rs \mid s \in \mathfrak{S}\}^\perp = \{\operatorname{Tr} U \mid U \in \mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}\}^\perp$.

(5) For any (two sided) Ore subset $\mathfrak{S}$ of $\mathcal{C}_R$, let $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}$ be as in (4). Then $T_\mathfrak{S} = R\mathfrak{S}^{-1} \oplus R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}/R$ is a tilting right R-module with tilting class $T_\mathfrak{S}^\perp = \{R/sR \mid s \in \mathfrak{S}\}^\perp = \mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}^\perp$.

Proof. (1) By Proposition 5.5 and Theorem 4.4, A/R is a directed union of modules N_i where each N_i is a finite extension of simple right R-modules. Hence, by Corollary 3.13, we get that T is a tilting module with tilting class $T^\perp = \mathcal{U}_r^\perp$. Moreover, $\mathcal{U}_r^\perp = \mathcal{V}_r^\perp$ since every element in $\mathcal{V}_r$ is a finite extension of elements in $\mathcal{U}_r$, see the discussion on Definition 4.3. On the other hand, by Corollary 3.14, the tilting class of $\mathcal{C}^{-1}R \oplus \mathcal{C}^{-1}R/R = T$ is $\mathcal{D}_r^\perp$.

(2) is proven with symmetric arguments.

(3) It is proved in [CB91, Remark 3.3] that every ring S with $R < S < A$ is the universal localization of R at some morphisms between finitely generated projective right (left) R-modules. Recall from [Sch85, Chapter 5] that the universal localizations of R embedding in R_u are in bijective correspondence with collections of stable association classes of atomic full morphisms. So, S is the universal localization of R at a unique subset $\mathcal{U}_S$ of $\mathcal{U}_r$ ($\mathcal{U}_l$). Now, because of Proposition 5.5 (2) and (3), we can apply Corollary 4.6(2).

(4) $T_\mathfrak{S}$ is a tilting left R-module with $T_\mathfrak{S}^\perp = \{R/Rs \mid s \in \mathfrak{S}\}^\perp$ by (the right version of) Corollary 3.14. Suppose we have proved that $R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}$ is the universal localization of R at $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}$. By Proposition 5.5, we can apply Corollary 4.6(2) to obtain the desired results.

We now prove that $R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}$ is the universal localization of R at $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}$. The argument is very similar to the one of [CB91, Lemma 3.4].

First of all, notice that ${}_R R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}$ is flat, and for every $U \in \mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}$, $U \otimes_R R\mathfrak{S}^{-1} = 0$. Hence, if $0 \to P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q \to U \to 0$ is a projective presentation of U with P and Q finitely generated, then $\alpha \otimes 1_{R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}}$ is invertible. Hence condition (i) in Theorem 3.2 is satisfied.

Let B be a ring with a map $b\colon R \to B$ such that for every $U \in \mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}$ and any finite projective presentation $0 \to P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q \to U \to 0$, $\alpha \otimes_R 1_B$ becomes invertible. Let $s \in \mathfrak{S}$. Consider R/sR. Since $\mathfrak{S}$ is right Ore, by Theorem 5.6, R/sR has finite length and therefore it has a finite filtration of simple right R-modules. Recall $\mathfrak{S}$ consists of non-zero-divisors. Hence $R/sR \cong s^{-1}R/R$. Since $\mathfrak{S}$ is a right Ore set, for every $s^{-1}r \in s^{-1}R$, there exist $t \in \mathfrak{S},\ x \in R$ such that $s^{-1}r = xt^{-1}$. Therefore, for every $z \in R/sR$ there exists $t \in \mathfrak{S}$ with $zt = 0$. This implies that all the composition factors of R/sR are in $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{S}$.

For each $s \in \mathfrak{S}$, define the morphism $\delta_s\colon R \to R$, given by $r \to sr$. By the foregoing, $\delta_s \otimes 1_B$ is invertible for every $s \in \mathfrak{S}$. Notice $\delta_s \otimes 1_B$ can be regarded as the morphism $B \to B$ defined by $x \mapsto b(s)x$. Thus $b(s)$ is invertible for all

$s \in \mathfrak{S}$. By the universal property of Ore localization there exists a morphism of rings $\gamma\colon R\mathfrak{S}^{-1} \to B$ making the following diagram commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd} R \arrow[rr] \arrow[dr, "b"'] & & R\mathfrak{S}^{-1} \arrow[dl, "\gamma"] \\ & B & \end{tikzcd}$$

Therefore condition (ii) in Theorem 3.2 is satisfied.

For (5) apply the left and the right versions of (4). ∎

Before stating the next results we recall the following definitions.

5.8. **Definitions.** (a) A right R-module M is *faithful* if the ideal $\operatorname{ann}(M) = \{r \in R \mid mr = 0 \text{ for all } m \in M\} = 0$. We say M is *unfaithful* if M is not a faithful module.

(b) Let Z be a commutative noetherian domain with quotient field K and let Q be a central simple K-algebra. A *Z-order* in Q is a Z-subalgebra R of Q, finitely generated as Z-module and such that R contains a K-basis of Q. A *hereditary order* R is a hereditary ring R which is a Z-order in some central simple K-algebra Q, where Z is some Dedekind domain with quotient field $K \neq Z$. The hereditary order R is a *maximal order* if it is not properly contained in any other Z-order in Q.

5.9. **Theorem.** *Let R be a hereditary noetherian prime ring which is not simple artinian. Let $\mathcal{U}_r$ be a set of representatives of all isomorphism classes of all simple right R-modules. Suppose that there are no simple faithful right R-modules and that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(U_1, U_2) = 0$ for any two non-isomorphic simple right R-modules U_1, U_2. Then*

$$\mathbb{T} = \{T_{\mathcal{W}} = R_{\mathcal{W}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{W}}/R \mid \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_r\}$$

is a representative set up to equivalence of the class of all tilting right R-modules.

In particular, the statement holds true when R is a maximal order or a hereditary local noetherian prime ring which is not a simple artinian ring (for example a not necessarily commutative discrete valuation domain).

Proof. For the first part we follow the terminology of [Lev00]. If M is a finitely generated right R-module, then $M = P \oplus V$ where P is projective and V is the submodule consisting of the torsion elements [MR87, Lemma 5.7.4]. Moreover, V is of finite length and has a decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ where V_1 is a (finite) direct sum of uniserial modules whose composition factors are all unfaithful, and V_2 is a direct sum of modules whose composition factors belong to so-called faithful towers [Kuz72, Theorem 2.19] or [KL95, Theorem 4.6]. Since we are assuming that there are no faithful simple right R-modules, $V_2 = 0$.

So $M^{\perp} = (W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_n)^{\perp}$ where W_i are indecomposable finitely generated uniserial modules. Since $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(U, U') = 0$ for any two non-isomorphic simple modules U, U', we obtain that all composition factors of W_i are isomorphic to the same simple module U_i. Hence $W_i^{\perp} = U_i^{\perp}$. Therefore $M^{\perp} = U_1^{\perp} \cap \cdots \cap U_n^{\perp}$. So for every set of finitely generated right R-modules $\mathcal{V}$, there exists a set of simple right R-modules $\mathcal{W}$ such that $\mathcal{V}^{\perp} = \mathcal{W}^{\perp}$. From Remark 3.6, Proposition 5.5 and Corollary 4.6(2) we infer that $\mathbb{T}$ is a representative set up to equivalence of the class of all tilting right R-modules.

Let R be a maximal order. That there are no faithful simple R-modules is a concatenation of the following results. By Lemma 5.3, every maximal right ideal contains a nonzero divisor, so it is essential [Jat86, 2.1.15]. Then the result follows by [GW89, Propositions 8.1, 8.3]. That maximal orders verify the hypothesis on the extensions of simple modules follows from [GW89, Theorem 11.20] and [Rei75, Theorem 22.4].

If R is a hereditary local noetherian prime ring which is not a simple artinian ring there is only one simple right R-module up to isomorphism, and it is unfaithful since it is isomorphic to the quotient of R by its maximal ideal. ■

We now recover the classification of tilting modules over Dedekind domains obtained in [BET05, Theorem 5.3].

5.10. **Corollary.** *Let R be a Dedekind domain.*

(1) Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a subset of max-spec(R)*. Consider the multiplicative subset of R $\mathfrak{S} = R \setminus \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathfrak{p}$ and the set of simple R-modules $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{S}} = \{R/\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{m} \nsubseteq \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathfrak{p}\}$ (if $\mathfrak{M} = \emptyset$, then $\mathfrak{S} = R\setminus\{0\}$). Then $R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}$ is the universal localization of R at $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ and $T_{\mathfrak{S}} = R\mathfrak{S}^{-1} \oplus R\mathfrak{S}^{-1}/R$ is a tilting R-module with $T_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\perp} = \{R/sR \mid s \in \mathfrak{S}\}^{\perp}$.*

(2) Let $\mathfrak{P}$ be a subset of max-spec(R)*. Consider $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{P}} = \{R/\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{P}\}$. Then $T_{\mathfrak{P}} = R_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{P}}} \oplus R_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{P}}}/R$ is a tilting right R-module with $T_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\perp}$. Therefore the set $\{T_{\mathfrak{P}} \mid \mathfrak{P} \subseteq$ max-spec$(R)\}$ is a representative set up to equivalence of the class of all tilting R-modules.*

Proof. (1) Recall that a Dedekind domain is a commutative noetherian prime ring which is not simple artinian. Now notice that

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{S}} = \{R/\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{m} \nsubseteq \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathfrak{p}\} = \{R/\mathfrak{m} \mid \text{ for every } v \in R/\mathfrak{m} \text{ there is } s \in \mathfrak{S} \text{ with } vs = 0\}.$$

Then apply Theorem 5.7(5).

(2) By Proposition 5.5 and Corollary 4.6(2), we obtain that $T_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is a tilting module with $T_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\perp}$.

For the second statement, we prove that R satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.9. All simple R-modules are unfaithful because they are isomorphic to the quotient of R by a maximal ideal. On the other hand let M be an extension of the nonisomorphic simple R-modules $R/\mathfrak{p}$ and $R/\mathfrak{q}$ with $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ nonzero prime ideals of R. Notice that $\operatorname{ann}(M) = \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{q}$. Therefore $M \cong T_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) \oplus T_{\mathfrak{q}}(M)$ where $T_{\mathfrak{p}}(M)$ and $T_{\mathfrak{q}}(M)$ denote the $\mathfrak{p}$-primary and the $\mathfrak{q}$-primary components of M. Therefore $M \cong R/\mathfrak{p} \oplus R/\mathfrak{q}$, see [BK00, Sections 5.1, 6.3]. ■

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dolors Herbera for interesting conversations and valuable suggestions. Among other things, she pointed out to us Remarks 3.6 and 3.4(4), and she suggested the proof of Theorem 5.9 for Dedekind domains.

This research was carried out during two visits of the second named author at Università dell'Insubria, Varese, in 2005 and 2006, supported by a grant of the Facoltà di Scienze dell'Università dell'Insubria, Varese, and by Departament d'Universitats, Recerca i Societat de la Informació de la Generalitat de Catalunya. The second named author would like to thank Dipartimento di Informatica e Comunicazione dell'Università degli Studi dell'Insubria di Varese for its hospitality.

First named author partially supported by PRIN 2005 "Prospettive in teoria degli anelli, algebre di Hopf e categorie di moduli".
Both authors partially supported by the DGI and the European Regional Development Fund, jointly, through Project MTM2005–00934, and by the Comissionat per Universitats i Recerca of the Generalitat de Catalunya, Project 2005SGR00206.

References

[AHHT05] Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Dolors Herbera, and Jan Trlifaj, *Divisible modules and localization*, J. Algebra **294** (2005), no. 2, 519–551.

[AHHT06] ———, *Tilting modules and Gorenstein rings*, Forum Math. **18** (2006), no. 2, 211–229.

[AHKH06] Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Henning Krause, and Dieter Happel (eds.), *Handbook of Tilting Theory*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series **332**, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[AHTT01] Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Alberto Tonolo, and Jan Trlifaj, *Tilting preenvelopes and cotilting precovers*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **4** (2001), no. 2, 155–170.

[ARS95] Maurice Auslander, Idun Reiten, and Sverre O. Smalø, *Representation theory of Artin algebras*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 36, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[BET05] Silvana Bazzoni, Paul C. Eklof, and Jan Trlifaj, *Tilting cotorsion pairs*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **37** (2005), no. 5, 683–696.

[BH08] Silvana Bazzoni and Dolors Herbera, *One dimensional tilting modules are of finite type*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **11** (2008), 43–61.

[BK00] A. J. Berrick and M. E. Keating, *An introduction to rings and modules with K-theory in view*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 65, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[CB91] W. W. Crawley-Boevey, *Regular modules for tame hereditary algebras*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **62** (1991), no. 3, 490–508.

[Coh85] P. M. Cohn, *Free Rings and Their Relations*, second ed., London Mathematical Society Monographs, vol. 19, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], London, 1985.

[CT95] Riccardo Colpi and Jan Trlifaj, *Tilting modules and tilting torsion theories*, J. Algebra **178** (1995), no. 2, 614–634.

[CTT07] Riccardo Colpi, Alberto Tonolo, and Jan Trlifaj, *Perpendicular categories of infinite dimensional partial tilting modules and transfers of tilting torsion classes*, J. of Pure and Appl. Algebra **211** (2007), 223–234.

[Dic77] Warren Dicks, *Mayer-Vietoris persentations over colimits of rings*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **34** (1977), no. 3, 557–576.

[ER70] David Eisenbud and J. C. Robson, *Modules over Dedekind prime rings*, J. Algebra **16** (1970), 67–85.

[FS85] Lászlo Fuchs and Luigi Salce, *Modules over valuation domains*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 97, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1985.

[GdlP87] P. Gabriel and J. A. de la Peña, *Quotients of representation-finite algebras*, Comm. Algebra **15** (1987), no. 1-2, 279–307.

[GL91] Werner Geigle and Helmut Lenzing, *Perpendicular categories with applications to representations and sheaves*, J. Algebra **144** (1991), no. 2, 273–343.

[GT06] Rüdiger Göbel and Jan Trlifaj, *Approximations and endomorphism algebras of modules*, de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 41, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin, 2006.

[GW89] K. R. Goodearl and R. B. Warfield, Jr., *An introduction to noncommutative Noetherian rings*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 16, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[Jat86] A. V. Jategaonkar, *Localization in Noetherian rings*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 98, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.

[Kei61] H. Jerome Keisler, *Ultraproducts and elementary classes*, Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 64 = Indag. Math. **23** (1961), 477–495.

[KL95] Lee Klingler and Lawrence S. Levy, *Wild torsion modules over Weyl algebras and general torsion modules over HNPs*, J. Algebra **172** (1995), no. 2, 273–300.

[KT05] Otto Kerner and Jan Trlifaj, *Tilting classes over wild hereditary algebras*, J. Algebra **290** (2005), no. 2, 538–556.

[Kuz72] James Kuzmanovich, *Localizations of HNP rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **173** (1972), 137–157.

[Lev00] Lawrence S. Levy, *Modules over hereditary Noetherian prime rings (survey)*, Algebra and its applications (Athens, OH, 1999), Contemp. Math., vol. 259, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000, pp. 353–370.

[Lüc97] Wolfgang Lück, *Hilbert modules and modules over finite von Neumann algebras and applications to L^2-invariants*, Math. Ann. **309** (1997), no. 2, 247–285.

[Luk91] Frank Lukas, *Infinite-dimensional modules over wild hereditary algebras*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **44** (1991), no. 3, 401–419.

[Luk93] ———, *A class of infinite-rank modules over tame hereditary algebras*, J. Algebra **158** (1993), no. 1, 18–30.

[Mat73] Eben Matlis, 1*-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1973, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 327.

[MR87] J. C. McConnell and J. C. Robson, *Noncommutative Noetherian rings*, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1987, With the cooperation of L. W. Small, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

[Nee07] Amnon Neeman, *Noncommutative localisation in algebraic k-theory ii*, Adv. Math. **213** (2007), 785–819.

[Rei75] I. Reiner, *Maximal orders*, Academic Press [A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1975, London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 5.

[Rin84] Claus Michael Ringel, *Tame algebras and integral quadratic forms*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1099, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.

[Sal04] Luigi Salce, *Tilting modules over valuation domains*, Forum Math. **16** (2004), no. 4, 539–552.

[Sal05] ———, *$\mathfrak{F}$-divisible modules and tilting modules over Prüfer domains*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **199** (2005), no. 1-3, 245–259.

[Sch85] A. H. Schofield, *Representation of rings over skew fields*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 92, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.

[Sch86] ———, *Universal localisation for hereditary rings and quivers*, Ring theory (Antwerp, 1985), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1197, Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp. 149–164.

[She71] Saharon Shelah, *Every two elementarily equivalent models have isomorphic ultrapowers*, Israel J. Math. **10** (1971), 224–233.

[Ste75] Bo Stenström, *Rings of quotients*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975, Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 217, An introduction to methods of ring theory.

[Zie84] Martin Ziegler, *Model theory of modules*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **26** (1984), no. 2, 149–213.

DIPARTIMENTO DI INFORMATICA E COMUNICAZIONE, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DELL'INSUBRIA, VIA MAZZINI 5, I - 21100 VARESE, ITALY

E-mail address: `lidia.angeleri@uninsubria.it`

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES, UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA, E-08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA), SPAIN

E-mail address: `jsanchez@mat.uab.cat`